

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
ACQ-2009-0610-RFP
AMENDMENT 1

This is an amendment to Request for Proposal (RFP) ACQ-2009-0610-RFP issued by the Washington State Transportation Commission for the development of a 20-year statewide transportation plan.

I. This RFP is amended as follows:

- a) **Section 7, Technical Requirements** – Is deleted in its entirety.
- b) **Section 4.2, Financial Information** – Replace in its entirety Section 4.2 of the RFP with the following:

4.2 (M) Financial Information

The Vendor must provide all information requested in the exact order specified below. This section is scored on a pass/fail basis. Failure to respond to any mandatory requirements will be viewed as non-responsive and the proposal may be disqualified.

- a. Financial Statements—The Vendor, and all Subcontractors, shall provide evidence of the firm's financial condition, sufficient in detail to demonstrate its ability to perform all the proposed Services.
 - i. The submission for each firm must include audited financial statements, including all schedules, notes and the opinion of an independent accounting firm, for the three (3) most recently completed fiscal years. In lieu of audited financial statements, the Vendor may submit the three (3) most recently completed fiscal years' financial statements, including all schedules and notes, accompanied by a letter of reference from the proposing Vendor's bank, corporate attorney or CPA firm. The letter of reference must sufficiently indicate that the Vendor's financial statements fairly represent the Vendor's ability to perform all the proposed Services. The statements must represent the entity submitting the proposal that will be responsible for the performance of all services, not a subsidiary or parent of the Vendor.
 - ii. The Vendor and all Subcontractors shall include evidence of their ability to provide the required bonding and insurance.
 - iii. Vendor and all Subcontractors may provide interim financial information, with a statement attesting to the accuracy of the information signed by the Chief Financial Officer of the firm, if such interim information is necessary to provide all of the required information.

- b. Banking Reference—Provide a reference from the company’s current bank to include a discussion of your business relationship, number of years with them, and standing.
 - i. Provide a credit rating and name the rating service.
 - ii. Provide a credit rating report and the name of the service providing the report. This report should be in the nature of or similar to Dun & Bradstreet’s Small Business eValuator report and include, at a minimum, information on:
 - 1. Payment performance trends.
 - 2. Status of legal filings, if any, such as bankruptcies, judgments, liens, lawsuits.
 - 3. Indicate if the company has ever been turned over to a collection agency for non-payment and, if so, describe the circumstances.
- c. Tax Information—The Vendor shall provide its Federal Employer Tax Identification number and the Washington Uniform Business Identification number issued by the State of Washington Department of Revenue.
- d. Provide information regarding the Vendor’s and all subcontractors’ solvency:
 - i. Has the Vendor or Subcontractors filed or been petitioned into bankruptcy or insolvency? If yes, provide details.
- e. Has the Vendor been cited or threatened with citation within the last five (5) years by federal or any state regulators for violations of any federal or state law and impending regulations? If yes, provide details, including the nature and outcome of the situation.

II. This RFP is amended to include the following Questions and Answers:

Q1. For what reason is the Commission undertaking the creation of a new transportation plan?

A1. The Washington Transportation Plan is an on-going long-range transportation plan for the State. The Legislature has required that it be reviewed and revised every four years and directed in 2007 that this update be completed by December 2010. For the first time, the WTP must be consistent with the state’s growth management goals. Many external factors that impact transportation needs and funding have changed since the November 2006 adoption of the current WTP, such as the worldwide recession, the drop in gas tax revenue and the adoption of greenhouse gas reduction goals.

Q2. Is the work effort identified in this contract intended to be an update to the previous plan or a completely new plan?

A2. The 2011 – 2030 WTP is a new statewide transportation plan that builds on the data and policies in the existing plan. Although this Plan will rely on modal plans developed by WSDOT, it is not intended to replace the WSDOT multimodal plan. And, while taking into account federal law and regulations regarding transportation planning and facilities, due to the current federal debate on transportation planning and funding, this process is not intended to meet the requirements for federal plan compliance at this time. This Plan also will more directly address local and regional priorities and needs as well as the priorities and needs of transit agencies, ensuring the end product is an all-inclusive vision for transportation statewide, as opposed to a plan and vision for only the “state system”.

Q3. Does the Commission prefer to reuse the process used to develop the previous plan?

A3. This update will follow a different process than was previously undertaken. The Commission has already initiated the update process, using a multi-jurisdictional and multi-interest Advisory Group to help shape the general outline and contents of this Plan. The Commission intends that the process to develop this Plan be collaborative with key governmental and private partners in moving people and goods, with ongoing opportunity for public review and input into the Plan as it is developed.

Q4. What consultants contributed to the previous plan?

A4. The previous plan was almost exclusively prepared by WSDOT under the direction of the Commission. There have not historically been any consultants used to develop the plan.

Q5. What consultants performed substantially similar services as outlined in the RFP for the previous plan?

A5. None.

Q6. During creation of the prior plan, was the communication and outreach effort effective from both State and constituent perspective?

A6. The prior plan had extensive outreach and public engagement, but it largely occurred towards the end of the process as opposed to throughout the process. It was mainly geared towards the open house style of outreach which has proven to be fairly ineffective – especially if those open houses are the main way of gathering public input. It is the expectation of the Commission that for this effort, there will be a more comprehensive and effective outreach and communication effort that will attempt to reach the public via various avenues, early on and throughout the update process.

Q7. Has the Commission or WDSOT leveraged a public relations firm to implement prior media plans? If so, which firm(s)?

A7. The Commission has not previously used public relations consultants, except for the purposes of public opinion research.

Q8. How many resources and what roles will be provided by “staff, consultants, and the Advisory Group that will draft, edit and deliver to the Commission a Draft Plan by Summer 2010”? Please describe the relative relationships of the team and the Vendor under contract in this RFP.

A8. The resources provided by Advisory Group members will vary depending on their internal capacity and their commitment to the WTP. Because the budget includes few resources for research, the Commission is relying upon Advisory Group members for new and updated data. The consultants referred to in the quoted portion of the RFP refer to the selected vendor.

Q9. What roles are vendors responding to this RFP expected to deliver: project manager, facilitator, author, communication & outreach planner or all of the above? Are there additional roles that the vendors are expected to deliver?

A9. Ideally, one vendor will provide – directly or through subcontracting – all of the requested roles. Commission staff will oversee the vendor work; however, it is preferable if the vendor designates a project manager as the single point of contact to liaison with Commission staff and Commissioners.

Q10. Section 7.1, Section Requirements, appears to be repeated in section 8.1, Section Requirements. The technical proposal appears to be 40% of the evaluation criteria – are there specific requirements to which vendors must respond?

A10. Section 7 is rescinded in its entirety.

Q11. Will more than one contract be awarded as a result of this RFP?

A11. It is our preference to award one contract to one “lead” vendor – who may perhaps be comprised of or supported by several sub-contractors.

Q12. Are there additional funds for the production of the plan and for the execution of the communication and outreach strategy beyond the budget for this effort?

A12. The Commission expects vendor proposals to include the execution of Communication and Outreach strategies within the advertised budget. The Commission has funds available for production and distribution of the Plan; however, responses may choose to include production within the bid.

Q13. The RFP references a draft outline that is being developed. Can DOT provide an initial copy of this draft outline for Vendor review?

A13. Neither the Commission nor WSDOT has an outline at this time as it is under development – it is expected to be available in mid-September. The Outline will build on the five transportation policy goals articulated by the legislature and recognize that transportation, economic development, land use and environment policy all interact and shape each other and the health of local communities.

Q14. The RFP references the completion date as “Summer” 2010. Does the commission have an expected end date for work being completed by the Vendor under this contract?

A14. The Commission is required to submit a 2011- 2030 WTP to the Legislature by December 2010. In order for public comment and review to occur, and to allow for subsequent Commission revision in response to public comment, a Draft Plan must be ready by Summer 2010. July 6, 2010 is the target date for a Draft Plan for Commission review to enable public release of a Draft Plan at the Commission’s July 2010 meeting.

The end date for vendor work will occur upon final Plan adoption by the Commission at its November or December 2010 meeting.

Q15. Section 8.4 states that there will not be a separate allowance for travel/per diem. We presume that travel/per diem should be included as separate line items on the budget submitted with the proposal. Please confirm or elaborate as to how the vendor should treat travel/per diem.

A15. The RFP says that travel and per diem expenses are the responsibility of the vendor. Therefore, the submitted proposal should include travel/per diem as a separate line item, within the administrative overhead, or otherwise covered by the vendor.

Q16. The Contract Terms and Conditions (Exhibit C) appears to be missing. Could you please forward a copy of the Sample Contract?

A16. The contract is posted on the website:
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Business/Contracts/default.htm>

Q17. RFP page 10, Section 2.20-Waivers states that Vendors shall obtain a waiver prior to submission of the proposal. However, RFP page 18, Section 4.4 – Contract Terms and Conditions states that Vendors may request exceptions in the proposal. Please clarify.

A17. Section 2.20 is specific to the RFP. Section 4.4 is specific to the proposed contract, Exhibit C.

Q18. We understand that WSTC has adopted or discussed a Communications Plan for this project. Can you send that Plan, or the key elements of it?

A18. See attached.

Q19. The Legislature's Joint Transportation Committee is undertaking a study of implementation issues associated with alternative transportation funding sources. How do you see the WTP as relating to or connecting with this study?

A19. The two efforts are related and connected. Commission staff sits on a JTC staff working group for the sole purpose of ensuring both efforts stay in tune with each other. We see the WTP setting forth the statewide 20 year transportation funding need and investment priorities. The JTC study will answer the "how do we fund it?" question. To that end, it will be critical that both efforts cooperate and communicate with each other.

Q20. Section 4.2 asks for 3 years of financial statements from both the prime firm and subconsultants.

- a.) Can this information be marked Confidential, and withheld from public disclosure?
- b.) Can subconsultants be exempted from this requirement?

A20.

- a) This information can be marked Confidential, however, it would only be withheld from public disclosure if covered under an exemption in RCW 42.56.
- b) No.

Q21. Can you please clarify the task on p. 23, regarding "design and publish draft and final copies of the plan." If the consultant designs the draft and final reports, providing camera-ready copies, can WSTC be responsible for printing?

A21. Yes. The Commission has funds available for production and distribution of the Plan; Responses may choose to include production within the bid.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS RFP REMAIN IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.